

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action dated April 20, 2004, claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claim 5 has been amended to overcome the typographical error. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the application in view of the amendments above and remarks below.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gutta* (6,424,273) in view of *Breed* (2002/0005778). Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants hereby incorporate the previous remarks herein. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections in view of the previously made amendments and remarks.

Applicants would like to highlight certain aspects of these remarks. Upon appeal, applicants will also emphasize these remarks to the Board. Key features of the claims include a rear-facing camera that has a rear field of view adjacent to a blind spot. As is shown in Fig. 1, the rear field of view is behind the car and is adjacent to the blind spot but does not include the blind spot. The controller is used to activate an indicator when the rear vehicle transitions into the blind spot from the rear field of view in response to the size and position signal for the rear approaching vehicle. Each of the independent claims describes the transition into a blind spot from the rear field of view.

The *Gutta* reference and the *Breed* reference are directed to blind spot systems that have a side camera that is directed into a blind spot. While the *Gutta* reference describes determining the relative speed and determining whether the vehicle is passing or falling behind the driver's vehicle using the image from the blind spot

camera as described in Col. 3, lines 52 through Col. 4, line 3, no teaching or suggestion is provided for a determination based on the transition into the blind spot. The *Breed* reference also does not teach transitioning into a blind spot from a rear field of view. On this basis, applicants, upon appeal, will set the above-mentioned arguments and the arguments set forth in the previous office actions to the Board. The previous arguments apply equally to independent claims 1, 7 and 13. Likewise, the dependent claims are also believed to be allowable since they are further limitations of their base claims.

Claims 3, 9 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gutta* in view of *Breed* as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of *Schnee*. The *Schnee* reference also does not teach or suggest the use of a camera adjacent to a blind spot. In the last office action, on page 4 the Examiner states that, "Gutta clearly discloses a rear-facing camera 16, 12, 14 having a rear field of view that is adjacent to a blind spot (see Fig. 2)." Applicants direct the Examiner to Col. 3, lines 1-14. It is clear from this description that a rearward and sideward field of view is obtained from the camera. While the blind spot is in a rearward and sideward position, the field of view is the blind spot shown by angle 24. Applicants agree that the blind spot is in a rearward and sideward position. However, applicants claims are directed to a rear-facing camera having a rear field of view which is different than a rearward field of view. The rear field of view is from the rear of the vehicle. A rearward camera on the side of the vehicle in the position illustrated by the *Gutta* reference does not have a rear field of view such as that shown in Fig. 1 of the present application. The present invention does not monitor the blind spot. Rather, the present invention monitors the

transition from the rear field of view into the blind spot field of view. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of claims 1, 7 and 13.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The applicants have added no new material to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa
Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: 6-18-04